



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/026,676 | 12/27/2001 | Patricia A. Robinson | 088305-0139 | 7052 |

7590 08/26/2005

William T. Ellis
Foley & Lardner
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5143

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2174

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,676

Applicant(s)

ROBINSON ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f):
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

pd

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-43 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment B, filed 7/22/2005.
3. Claims 1-43 are pending in this application. This action is final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 1-3, 8-11, 16-19, 24-27, 32-35, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Lewallen ("Lewallen", US 6,801,224) in view of Stanley ("Stanley", Extend Office 2000 Applications with custom-coded add-ins).

As per independent claim 1, Lewallen discloses a method for dynamically developing a user interface in an existing software application, comprising:
invoking a user interface developer component (Column 6 lines 42-44) during the execution of the software application (Column 8 lines 54-57); identifying one or more fields to include in the user interface (Column 8 lines 54-57; *add buttons and tables*); associating a field type for each of

the identified one or more fields (Column 8 lines 54-57;*buttons, text*) saving the identified one or more fields and associated field types in a user interface definition file (Column 8 lines 12-19;*modify, create nodes*); and generating the user interface based on the user interface definition file during the execution of the software application (Column 8 lines 12-19;*nodes that implement the user interface*). Lewallen fails to distinctly point out creating a user interface and associating the user interface to a function of the software application. However, Stanley teaches creating a user interface and associating it with a function of the software application (Page 1 lines 21-26). Stanley also teaches saving the association of the user interface to the function of the software application in a user interface definition (Page 5 lines 8-15), and generating the user interface when the associated function is triggered based on the definition file during the execution of the software application (Page 3 lines 40-48) Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Lewallen with the teaching of Stanley. Motivation to do so would have been to provide increased capability to an existing interface.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Lewallen-Stanley discloses a method, further comprising: providing one or more values for at least one of the identified one or more fields depending upon the associated field type (Column 7 lines 50-55;*add change content*); and saving the one or more values in the user interface definition file (Column 7 lines 59-67, Column 8 lines 1-3).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Lewallen-Stanley discloses a method, wherein the user interface definition file is saved as an XML file (Column 8 lines 4-7).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Lewallen-Stanley discloses a method, wherein the user interface developer component is implemented as a plug-in (*wherein a plug-in*

is defined as a module that can be added to a large computer application give it greater capabilities) for the software application. (Column 1 lines 62-67; *plugin application*).

Claims 9,17,25,33 are individually similar in scope to claim 1, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 10,18,26,34 are individually similar in scope to claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11,19,27,35 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16,24,32,40 are individually similar in scope to claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 1, Lewallen-Stanley teaches a method wherein the associated function is triggered in response to an input received by the software application (Stanley, Page 3 lines 40-48).

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 41, Lewallen-Stanley fails to distinctly point out a drop down menu. However, Official Notice is taken that selection from a drop down menu is well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Lewallen-Stanley with the current teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a compact and flexible way of presenting elements.

As per claim 43, which is dependent on claim 1, Lewallen-Stanley teaches a method wherein the step of associating the user interface with a function includes receiving a selection of the function from a list of functions of the software application (Stanley, Page 1 lines 33-35).

Art Unit: 2174

7. Claims 4-7, 12-15, 20-23, 28-31, 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lewallen ("Lewallen", US 6,801,224) and Stanley ("Stanley", Extend Office 2000 Applications with custom-coded add-ins) in view of Menachemi et al ("Menachemi", US 2002/0103810).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Lewallen-Stanley fails to distinctly point out parsing the definition file to generate the user interface although it is inherent. However, Menachemi teaches a method, wherein the generating includes parsing the user interface definition file to generate the user interface ([0050] lines 6-10). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Lewallen-Stanley with the teaching of Menachemi. Motivation to do so would have been to provide access, if needed, to modify each of the documents objects on the fly.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Lewallen-Stanley fails to distinctly point out transforming the parsed definition file into objects although it is inherent. However, Menachemi teaches a method, wherein the generating further includes transforming the parsed user interface definition file into one or more objects ([0051] lines 6-8;*elements*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the method of Lewallen-Stanley with the teaching of Menachemi. Motivation to do so would have been to provide access, if needed, to modify each of the documents objects on the fly.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Lewallen-Menachemi teach a method, wherein the one or more objects are Java (Lewallen, Column 8 lines 28-35;*converting interface to java*) (Column 7 lines 15-17).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, Lewallen-Menachemi teach a method, wherein the generating further includes displaying the user interface based on the one or more objects (Column 13 lines 11-19)

Claims 12,20,28,36 are individually similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13,21,29,37 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14,22,30,38 are individually similar in scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15,23,31,39 are individually similar in scope to claim 7, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm M-Th, and alternating F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100